

Remarks

Claims 1-15, 18-59, and 64-67 are pending and currently stand rejected. Claims 16-17 were previously cancelled. Claims 60-63 were previously withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1, 22, 27, 33, 45, 48-51, 54-59, and 67 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Summary of July 28, 2010, Examiner Interview

At the outset, the undersigned representative notes with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiner Fisher and Examiner Mooneyham during the interview held on July 28, 2010. During the interview, the features recited in claim 1 and the collection of Price Watch references were discussed substantially as set forth herein.

Specifically, Examiners Fisher and Mooneyham agreed that clarifying claim 1 (e.g., "generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to annotate the content document by annotating ~~create one or more annotations~~ for one or more key elements in the content document") overcomes the collection of Price Watch references. In addition, Examiners Fisher and Mooneyham agreed to withdraw the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15, 18-59, 64-65 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for alleged enablement deficiencies, written description deficiencies, or both. Claims 1-21, 27-44, 54-59 and 64-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 for alleged indefiniteness.

Allegations in the outstanding Office action concerning the "enablement" rejections are heavily based on allegations that the rejected claims recite "new matter" (which is understood by the undersigned to relate to the "written description" requirement set forth in § 112 ¶ 1). In an effort to fully respond to the outstanding Office action so this application can proceed to issuance, and since it is unclear whether the stated rejection is intended to be an "enablement" rejection, a "written description" rejection, or both, both requirements of § 112 ¶ 1 are addressed herein.

- I. At least because the original specification states that “Target documents may also be returned from World Wide Web servers or other networked systems [and not a Central Computer System]”, the original specification provides sufficient written description of the objected-to features in the rejected claims.

The original specification allegedly lacks sufficient written description to support the claim 1 recitation “wherein the central computer system is not the computer system providing the content document to the client computer system.” Although Applicant respectfully disagrees, claim 1 has been amended to expedite prosecution, to save on costs, or both. The amendments to claim 1 recast the objected-to recitation of claim 1 as “wherein other than the central computer system provides the content document to the client computer system.”

The original specification provides support for these amendments. For example, Paragraph [0068] of the published application (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0060162) describes “query[ing] … the CCS [Central Computer System], or another server, to search for product information related to [a search] term. An example of information output is a document .... The document is a web page with products related to the query term ....” Also, in describing Example 1, Paragraph [0078] states that “[t]ypically, a content provider 4 will serve an electronic content document [to the client computer system]. … Before the Client receives the content document 8.2 from a content server 4, the CCS 2 may initially serve 8.8 the client an original or updated Key List 14, or URL identifier list, for use with the Recognizer 20 and Annotator 30.” Paragraph [0079] states “a target document 8.12 may be provided by the CCS server to the Client; however, this is just an example. Target documents may also be returned from World Wide Web servers or other networked systems 5. The document may be delivered by any computer system dictated by the identifier for a Key Element.” [Emphasis added.] FIG. 10 also shows a Content Provider Computer System other than the Central Computer System providing a content document to a client computer system.

Accordingly, the specification describes in at least several portions that the central computer system is not the computer system providing a content document to the client computer system. Thus, the specification provides a written description for the recitation “wherein other than the central computer system provides the content document to the client computer system” in amended claim 1.

The portions of the specification referred to above also provide sufficient written description of the features recited in claims 2-15, 18-59, 64-65 and 67 that are objected to in the outstanding Office action. To the extent that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 are intended as written description rejections, they should be withdrawn.

II. The original specification includes an enabling disclosure for the subject matter claimed in claims 1-15, 18-59, 64-65 and 67

Based on the reference to *In re Mayhew* and the associated statements on page 3 of the outstanding Office action, the basis for the “enablement” rejection of each of claims 1-15, 18-59, 64-65 and 67 appears to be that each respective claim allegedly omits features described as being essential. In particular, it appears that the Office has taken the position that the Applicant has described a Central Computer System (CCS) providing a content document to a client computer system as being essential. If indeed this is the Office’s position, such a position would be in error; the specification describes several examples where the CCS is not the computer system providing a content document to the client computer system.

In addition, the undersigned is unaware of any statement in the file history to the effect that a CCS must be the system that provides a content document to the client computer system. Moreover, the undersigned also understands that nothing in the executable code accompanying this application as Appendices A, B and C requires the CCS to be the system that provides a content document to the client computer system.

For at least these reasons, the stated “enablement” rejections of claim 1-15, 18-59, 64-65 and 67 have been traversed and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 15, 18, 20-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42, 44-55, 57, 59, and 64-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) for allegedly being anticipated by archived webpages from a “Price Watch” website ([www.pricewatch.com](http://www.pricewatch.com)).

I. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 1

For convenience, amended claim 1 is reproduced in its entirety, with emphasis added:

A computer-implemented method for generating annotation instructions in a system comprising a content provider computer system storing content documents, a central computer system, and a client computer system provided with a content document, the method comprising:

in an electronic content **document retrievable from the content provider computer system** storing content documents, embedding programming language code executable by the client computer to invoke the central computer system to recognize key elements based on key elements contained in a key-element list;

on the central computer system, recognizing key elements in the document based on the key elements in the key-element list; and

on the central computer system, generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to *annotate the content document by annotating* one or more key elements in the content document; and sending the annotation instructions from the central computer system to the client computer system, wherein a *computer system other than the central computer system provides the content document to the client computer system*

Amended claim 1 recites that the client computer system is provided with a content document, and that a computer system other than the central computer system provides the content document to the client computer system. In contrast, the collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest that a *computer system other than the central computer system* provides the content document to the client computer system. Indeed, several of the Price Watch references include the statement that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.”

In addition, claim 1 recites “generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to annotate the content document by annotating one or more key elements in the content document.” As agreed during the July 28, 2010, interview, the collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest generating annotation instructions as claimed.

Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not teach (let alone suggest) each and every feature recited in independent claim 1. The anticipation rejection of independent claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The previous claim 1 recitation “the central computer system is not the computer system providing the content document to the client computer system” appears not to have been considered in the latest round of examination, despite that the recitation was added to claim 1 based on an apparently favorable interview. Applicants do not acquiesce in the position taken by the Office with regard to whether the recitation of previous claim 1 should be considered.

Amending claim 1 to recite “generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to create one or more annotations for annotate the content document by annotating one or more key elements in the content document” merely clarifies the earlier recitation and is not intended to change the scope of that which was (and is) claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant reserves all rights to pursue in this or a continuing application claims reciting identical or similar combinations of features as previously presented claim 1. In view of the advanced stage of prosecution of this application, independent claim 1 has been amended to advance prosecution, to save costs, or both.

II. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 2-15, 18 and 19 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-15, 18 and 19 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 2-15, 18 and 19 for at least the same reasons as it does not anticipate independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 2-15, 18 and 19 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

III. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 20

Independent claim 20 recites that "*the first computer system receives the web page when it is being presented to the user of the second computer system*" and the source of the web page is a *content provider computer system* other than the first and second computer systems." Emphasis added.

The collection of Price Watch references does not disclose at least these features of independent claim 20. On page 14 of the outstanding Office action, the Office acknowledges as much, stating that information is fed to a central computer system from a reseller, and *subsequently* to a user "through the central computer system."

At least because claim 20 recites that the first computer system receives the web page *when it is being presented* to the user of the second computer system (and not before presenting it to a user, as disclosed in the collection of Price Watch references), the collection of Price Watch references does not disclose each and every element of claim 20. Thus, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 20.

Also, claim 20 recites that the source of the web page is a content provider computer system other than the first and second computer systems. In contrast, the Office states that, in the Price Watch approach, content, regardless of its source, is "fed ... through the central computer system" to a user. In the Price Watch approach, as acknowledged by the Office, the source of the *web page* sent to the user's computer system is the Price Watch central computer system, and not a content provider computer system other than the first and second computer systems, as recited in claim 20.

Thus, none of the Price Watch references, let along their collection, discloses each and every feature recited in independent claim 20. The anticipation rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn.

IV. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 21 at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 20.

Dependent claim 21 depends from and thus incorporates the features of independent claim 20. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claim 21 for at least the same reasons as it does not anticipate independent claim 20, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claim 20 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

V. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 22.

Amended claim 22 recites that the web page information corresponds to a web page from a computer system other than the client and central computer systems. In contrast, the collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest that the web page information corresponds **to a web page from a computer system** other than the client and central computer systems. Indeed, several of the Price Watch references state the opposite – i.e., that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.”

Accordingly, none in the collection of Price Watch references, nor their collection, teaches (let alone suggests) each and every feature recited in independent claim 22. The anticipation rejection of independent claim 22 should be withdrawn.

VI. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 23-26 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 22.

Dependent claims 23-26 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 22. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 23-26 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 22, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 23-26 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

VII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 27.

Independent claim 27 recites “receiving from the content provider computer system an electronic document ...; from a central computer system other than the content provider computer system ... sending instructions ... for presenting the user of the consumer computer system one or more hyperlinks related to a key element **on the electronic document** ....” The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of

features recited in independent claim 27. Indeed, the Office acknowledges but apparently overlooks this fact in its analysis on page 19.

For example, the action states that “the user is presented a website with search results containing … lists of dealers … upon the central computer system. … [T]he user is presented with a hyperlink for that dealer *which brings up … the dealer website which is the electronic document the user is presented with.*”

As explained by the Office, the Price Watch approach presents a user with a website *that is different from the claimed electronic document.* Yet it is this website that allegedly contains the claimed hyperlinks. However, claim 27 recites that the claimed hyperlinks are presented “*on the electronic document,*” which the Office acknowledges is different from the website presented to the user in the Price Watch approach. ,

Even if the website with the list of hyperlinks could be considered to be the claimed electronic document, the website is understood to be provided by the Price Watch computer system, and not a content provider computer system other than a central computer system.

The collection of Price Watch references does not disclose each and every element of claim 27. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn.

VIII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 28-32 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 27.

Dependent claims 28-32 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 27. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 28-32 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 27, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 28-32 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

IX. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 33.

Independent claim 33 recites that “key elements in the document … were *not previously annotated by a content provider providing the document; and wherein the content provider is a computer system other than the first and second computer systems.*” Independent claim 33 also recites that “the annotations [are] in addition to native content in the electronic document, as renderably received by the first computer system.” The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 33. Indeed, the Office acknowledges but apparently overlooks this fact in its analysis on page 22.

For example, the action states that “dealers … provide the information to the central computer system … and … this information is used to create the database search results.” It is understood that the dealers do not provide renderable electronic documents, based on the statement on several of the Price Watch references that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.” Moreover, it is understood that, according to the Price Watch approach, the central computer system collates the information provided by the dealers into one or more renderable documents.

At least because no renderable document is provided by a content provider computer system “other than the first and second computer systems,” as recited in independent claim 33, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 33. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn.

X. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 34-44 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 33.

Dependent claims 34-44 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 33. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 34-44 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 33, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 34-44 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

XI. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 45.

Independent claim 45 recites a computer implementable method in which a central computer system transmits to a consumer computer system a code for allowing the consumer computer system to recognize and annotate predetermined key elements. The recited method also provides that the central computer system, in response to a request from the consumer computer system, sends a set of, *inter alia*, predetermined key elements for use in creating the annotations for key elements on an electronic document. The annotations are in addition to the native content of the document, as renderably received by the consumer computer system. The source of the electronic document is a computer system other than the consumer and central computer systems.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 45. Indeed, the collection of Price Watch references at best describes an approach in which “dealers … provide information to a central computer system … and … this information is used to create database search results.” It is

understood that the dealers do not provide renderable electronic documents, based on the statement on several of the Price Watch references that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.” After receiving information from the dealers in the Price Watch approach, the central computer system collates the individual pieces of information provided by the dealers into a renderable electronic document that is transmitted to a client computer system.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest that a computer system other than the central computer system can provide a renderable document that is subsequently annotated, as recited in independent claim 45, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 45. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 45 should be withdrawn.

XII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 46 and 47 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 45.

Dependent claims 46 and 47 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 45. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 46 and 47 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 45, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 46 and 47 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

XIII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 48.

Independent claim 48 recites code that causes the central computer system to generate annotation instructions that cause the client computer system to annotate an electronic page received by the client computer system from a content provider computer system other than the central computer system. The annotations are made in addition to native content of the original electronic page, as renderably received by the client computer system.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 48. Indeed, the collection of Price Watch references at best describes an approach in which “dealers … provide information to a central computer system … and … this information is used to create database search results.” It is understood that the dealers do not provide renderable electronic documents, based on the statement on several of the Price Watch references that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.” After receiving information from the dealers in the Price Watch approach, the central computer system collates the individual pieces of information

provided by the dealers into a renderable electronic document that is transmitted to a client computer system.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not cause a client computer system to annotate an electronic page in addition to its native content, as recited in independent claim 48, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 48. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 48 should be withdrawn.

XIV. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 49.

Independent claim 49 recites code adapted to cause a consumer computer system to annotate an electronic page received from a content provider computer system other than the central computer system. The annotations are in addition to native content of the original electronic page, as renderably received by the client computer.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 49. Indeed, the collection of Price Watch references at best describes an approach in which “dealers … provide information to a central computer system … and … this information is used to create database search results.” It is understood that the dealers do not provide renderable electronic documents, based on the statement on several of the Price Watch references that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.” After receiving information from the dealers in the Price Watch approach, the central computer system collates the individual pieces of information provided by the dealers into a renderable electronic document that is transmitted to a client computer system.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not cause a consumer computer system to annotate an electronic page in addition to its native content, as recited in independent claim 49, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 49. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 49 should be withdrawn.

XV. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 50-52 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 49.

Dependent claims 50-52 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 49. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 50-52 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 49, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 50-52 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

XVI. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 53.

Independent claim 53 recites a computer system comprising a central computer system, a client computer system and a content provider computer system. An annotation module stored on either the central computer system or the client computer system is configured to annotate an electronic page from the content provider computer system with annotations of key elements that were not previously recognized or annotated, or both, by the content provider computer system.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 53. Indeed, the collection of Price Watch references at best describes an approach in which “dealers … provide information to a central computer system … and … this information is used to create database search results.” It is understood that the dealers do not provide renderable electronic documents, based on the statement on several of the Price Watch references that “[Prices] are entered by dealer in real-time and DO NOT come from websites.” After receiving information from the dealers in the Price Watch approach, the central computer system collates the individual pieces of information provided by the dealers into a renderable electronic document that is transmitted to a client computer system.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest an annotation module, as recited in independent claim 53, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 53. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 53 should be withdrawn.

XVII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 54.

Independent claim 54 recites a computer readable medium having instructions arranged as a web document and being storable in memory on a server.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 54. In particular, in the Price Watch references, the prices are do not come from websites.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest the computer readable medium, as recited in independent claim 54, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 54. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 54 should be withdrawn.

XVIII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claims 55-59 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 54.

Dependent claims 55-59 depend from and thus incorporate the features of independent claim 54. Accordingly, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate dependent claims 55-59 for at least the same reasons that it does not anticipate independent claim 54, as well as for the additional features recited in dependent claims 55-59 that are not disclosed in the Price Watch references, individually or collectively.

XIX. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 64.

Independent claim 64 recites a computer-implemented method for generating annotation instructions in a system comprising a content provider computer system, a central computer system, and a client computer system.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 64, at least for the same reasons as argued above for claim 1.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest the computer-implemented method, as recited in independent claim 64, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 64. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 64 should be withdrawn.

XX. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 65.

Independent claim 65 recites a computer-implemented method in a system comprising at least a content provider computer system, a central computer system, and a consumer computer system.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 65, at least for the same reasons as argued above for claim 27.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest the computer-implemented method, as recited in independent claim 65, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 65. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 65 should be withdrawn.

XXI. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 66.

Independent claim 66 recites a computer-implemented method for use on a system of networked computers.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 66, at least for the reasons set forth above.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest the computer-implemented method, as recited in independent claim 66, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 66. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 66 should be withdrawn.

XXII. The collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate independent claim 67.

Independent claim 67 claims a computer readable medium.

The collection of Price Watch references does not provide for or even suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 67, at least for the reasons set forth above.

At least because the Price Watch approach does not provide for or even suggest the computer readable medium, as recited in independent claim 67, the collection of Price Watch references does not anticipate claim 67. Thus, the anticipation rejection of claim 67 should be withdrawn.

XXIII. The collection of Price Watch references does not constitute a single reference that can anticipate a claimed combination of features

Moreover, the applied collection of Price Watch references does not constitute a single reference – the relied-upon web pages appear to have been published at different times (even assuming that the web archive's time and date stamp is correct). Thus, no single prior art reference discloses each and every feature recited in the allegedly anticipated claims.

Accordingly, none of claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 15, 18, 20-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42, 44-55, 57, 59, and 64-67 is anticipated by any of the applied Price Watch references, let alone by the collection of them.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 4, 32, 56, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over archived webpages from a “Price Watch” website ([www.pricewatch.com](http://www.pricewatch.com)) in view of Ryan Kelley “You can’t inspect that blouse or shirt” (July 21, 1997).

Claims 12, 14, 41, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over archived webpages from a “Price Watch” website ([www.pricewatch.com](http://www.pricewatch.com)).

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over archived webpages from a “Price Watch” website ([www.pricewatch.com](http://www.pricewatch.com)) in view of PR Newswire: “Check Point Software Technologies and Trend Micro Team to Combat Internet Gateway Security Threats” (October 5, 1998) hereafter Newswire.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

At least for the analogous reasons as set forth above, there is no prima facie case for unpatentability because the primary reference is missing elements. One of ordinary skill in the art cannot arrive at the claimed inventions based on the teachings of Price Watch, alone, or in combination with the cited references. Therefore, dependent claims 4, 12, 14, 19, 32, 41, 43, 56, and 58 and independent claim 20 are patentable at least for the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome and requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**No Disclaimer**

Nothing herein should be deemed as a disclaimer or surrender of any rights, acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been raised but were not raised herein or otherwise during prosecution of this application. All rights in and to subject matter disclosed in this application are reserved, including the right to claim all such subject matter in this or a related application using the same or substantially similar claims to

any claims that have been presented in this application, or using one or more alternative claimings.

### CONCLUSION

Each pending claim is in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all pending rejections be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be entered as to all claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including extension fees, or to charge any additional fees or underpayments, or to credit any overpayments, to the Credit Card account referenced and authorized via the EFS Web (Electronic Filing System). As an alternative, in case the Credit Card cannot be processed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, additional fees, or underpayments, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1001.

Please contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
GANZ LAW, P.C.



Hilde M. L. Coeckx  
Registration No. 57506

P. O. Box 2200  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123  
Telephone: (503) 844-9009  
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172  
email: mail@ganzlaw.com